



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov


APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/787,881	06/28/2001	Morten Meldal	030307/0198	9838
22428	7590	11/29/2005	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP			RAHMANI, NILOOFAR	
SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3000 K STREET NW				
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			1625	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/787,881	MELDAL ET AL.
	Examiner Niloofer Rahmani	Art Unit 1625

All Participants:


(1) Niloofer Rahmani

Status of Application: pending

(2) Vidmoham'ram.

(3) Margaret D. Seaman.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 November 2005

Time: 9:30 AM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

10-14, 28-32, 34

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

D. MARGARET SEAMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Telephone call was made on 11/21/2005 with the attorney Vidmoham'ram. The attorney wanted the examiner to check the status of claim 10 with William R. Dixon. The examiner informed the applicants that claims 11 and 12 are improper multiple dependent claims. The rejection of record for PEG of claims 12-14, 28-32 and the duplicate claim for 34 were discussed.